



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,988	07/23/2001	Shigeru Tanaka	Q64671	1372

7590

07/29/2004

SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

PRONE, JASON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/909,988	Applicant(s) TANAKA ET AL. cn	
	Examiner Jason Prone	Art Unit 3724	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8 and 10-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4,4,11,13,14,and 16-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,6-8,10,12 and 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 25 and 26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 3, and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wakai et al.

Wakai et al. discloses the invention including an apparatus of estimating a lifetime of a cutter (Abstract), a detector for detecting a value of a current loaded on the motor, a comparator (62), an output element (Column 3 third paragraph), that the comparator determines if the cutter is unfit for use (Column 3 third paragraph), that the comparator is in a microcomputer (18), and a motor driving the cutter (22). The examiner notes that current is measured in amps and an ammeter is used to measure amps therefore it is inherent that an ammeter would be present.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakai et al. as applied to claim 1 above. Wakai et al. discloses the invention but fails to disclose

the use of a visual display, however, official notice is taken that the use of an output element comprising a visual display is old and well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Wakai et al. with an output element comprising a visual display for an easier way of seeing the output element.

5. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakai et al. as applied to claim 1 above, in further view of Kiyohara et al.. Wakai et al. discloses the invention including the apparatus for estimating the lifetime of a cutter (see above) but fails to disclose a fixed blade, a movable blade that is movable along the fixed blade, a receiving element that is movable together with the movable blade, a support for supporting the movable blade and a support for supporting the receiving element, and that the supports are intergral with one another. Kiyohara et al. teaches a fixed blade (94), a movable blade that is movable along the fixed blade (42), a receiving element that is movable together with the movable blade (82), a support for supporting the movable blade (80) and a support for supporting the receiving element (80), and that the supports are intergral with one another (Fig. 7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Wakai et al. with the cutting apparatus, at taught by Kiyohara et al., to allow for the cutting of a flexible web.

6. Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakai et al. as applied to claims 1, 3, and 6-8 above. In light of the apparatus rejection, the method is inherent.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 25 and 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 6-8, 10, 12, and 22-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Nishimura et al., Tanaka, and Kohda et al.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Prone whose telephone number is 703-605-4287. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00, Mon - (every other) Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan N. Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 3724

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A stylized handwritten signature consisting of a large loop followed by a smaller loop and a trailing line.

JP
July 23, 2004

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Allan'.

Allan N. Shoap
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700